

On the Apodicticity of Being and the Illusion of Loss: A Phenomenological Analysis of Consciousness and Temporality

I must clarify that in my framework, the Analytic of Saturated emptiness, I do not treat concepts like they are different from me. I treat them like they are part of me (because the way they show up for me is literally because I'm the one who holds the space for them to show up), that they're something different from me (because I can stand apart from them through judgement, analysis, study, acceptance, rejection, denial, synthesis, etc., generally speaking, engagement), that they hold themselves together as what they were when they first showed up while I'm no longer the one for who they're showing up for in the way I would be were I the one holding the space for them in engaging them. Where concepts hold themselves together while I'm holding the space for other concepts, engaging them directly, the concepts maintaining their hold, express themselves in the direct engagements I'm having elsewhere in other concepts. This is a conscious embodiment, which I've often expressed as being-with-in-and-as in my philosophy. The with-in-and-as really just expresses more particularly the relational and, more specifically, contingent/conditioned nature of phenomena in general.

Concepts, phenomenologically, are treated through the perception of being embodied, as part of the embodied nature of conscious experience. So, when I talk of things like "temporality", I talk about the concept of temporality, the nature of temporality as held in direct engagement with the embodying (the experience of being the same as, standing in relation to, and in-volved in) experiencing consciousness. That is, whatever is consciously experienced (either reflectively, pre-reflectively, or apriori to reflection, i.e., primordially) takes on an all-encompassing embodiment. Even this approach, though, has its concerns since what gets called "experience" and what gets called "consciousness" are quite confused and misapprehended.

First, "conscious embodiment" or just "embodiment" is a product of ego (Western)/ Ego (Vedantic). The "embodiment" of "consciousness" is phenomena showing up and attaching to one another as an active negation of what we call "consciousness". There is no such thing as "consciousness". Why? Because it is a misperception of the ego (the dynamic, "living", structural matrix of attached phenomena). That there is anything at all is enough to stand as substantial evidence, for the ego, that there is not nothing -- and this is the exact "substantial evidence" that betrays its

misperception. The negation, alone, of nothing is the proof that there is something. This negative, however, shows up in a variety of ways -- for example it shows up in the relationship between death and desire. But, more poignantly, it is the very "something" that stands as the ultimate proof *against* the argument of a simple, basic, pure negation. What is not contingent/conditioned?

Let me pause here before providing you with a poetic expression of what is intended here, to let you grapple these ideas, and get on the same page with me.

***The Selflessness of a Funerary Procession & Its Speakers
or How One's "Timeliness" Is.***

Hello...

I could come up here and say a series of things about *their* life as it was, here, at the crossroads of an indefinitely definite distance away, infinitely nearby a world after which we are all so desperately longing for (whoever this "we" and "all" are).

But what I don't want to do is come up here and make a series of claims that are *insubstantial*. What I'm not going to do is come up here and talk about this *transcendent human being* in a way that is not clear, or definite, or *substantial*.

What I'm going to do is talk about them in a way that *must* be the case -- that is *apodictically* the case, literally, because O Logos dictates that it can be no other way.

That is, what *I do know* is that they existed.

Or, rather, they had *existence*. They had a personal *way of being* that was very *specific to them*. I can assume they were *real*.

And I say "real" and *let speak all* the "concrete" ways this illustrative term comes to speak -- as "illusory," "fallen," "projected," "objective," "subjective," "evolving," "devolving," "degrading," etc., etc., so and so forth.

In coming up here and stating what *must* be, I *can be sure*, in the myriad of potential ways this "real" gets itself *interpreted* as real, they were real.

I can be sure that they were real because their personal way of being – their *existence* – disclosed itself, revealed itself, spoke for itself *to me* – and not just in their words or the body's movements, but in the pink, soft shirts they wore, the roles they took as sometimes clerk or sometimes grandmother or sometimes mother or sometimes babysitter, or sometimes as driver of a car from 3pm to 315pm from this point A to this point B. All these, and some innumerable many *specific* other ways, constituted the way in which “she” spoke through this personal existence *to me*.

I know they were real.

Now,

Can I be sure that they were a *conscious* being?

Since, I say “real” and “existing,” and if you are “emotional” and “empathetically” aware, then as they say, you will at least *intimate* the notion that they were, individually, aware.

But can I be *sure of this*?

Not really:

I didn't experience *their* consciousness. In the same way that you cannot experience mine, here and now.

If we take the position that we are all conscious beings and I ask you to meditate upon this thought right now:

“In the entirety of your existence, engaged in this world as you *immanently* always-already are, have you experienced or will you experience *my* conscious experience back-then, right-now, or here-after? Have *you* really experienced *my* lived experience?” –

Would you not immediately respond to the accord, “*No not ever, nor will I ever,*” lest you be in such a condition that you respond alternatively ~ in which case, I'd inquire: Has no one advised you to a doctor?

Alas! If I am to come up here and let certainty speak, what *can* I say with certainty?

I can say:

I am being-consciousness-transcendentally. *I am* conscious in “this” here-now-unendingly. *I* experience *This-thisness* – which I hear called and call myself: being “here,” being “there,” being “then,” being “now,” being “this,” being “that,” being “one,” being “many,” being “singular,” being “plural,” being “so” ...and so forth, etc.-et-cetera-ing-ly.

I *can* say:

In my conscious experience I find, for myself, that *every existing thing* is conditioned and conditional so that, I find *in this flame* –

which I light and set before me to say, "it is a flame that is inside the Universe; a flame that I find inside this galaxy; it is a flame circumscribed within these celestial ellipses; a flame that I find burning on this very planet; a flame that I find burning in the United States; a flame that I find burning here in Massachusetts; a flame that I find here on this street; a flame that I find burning within these 4 walls surrounding; a flame that I find burning within this casing; it is a flame that I find burning, waving" so that when all these conditionalities have settled, and have been meditatively negated away, to the state where all I find is the flame's *flame-ing*, I find

- that there really *is nothing* to the flame *at all*

<< To the flame, to the candle, to the four walls within which this candle sits burning, to the globe, to the galaxy, to the Universe, to the multiplicity thereof >>

I find only that a flame finds itself *flamingly-burning* precisely because This "flame" has *some place to be at some time, showing up in some way*, disclosing itself...unconcealing itself...*speaking for itself as itself from (within) itself by itself* according to every possible within which, by which, on which, around which, upon which, in which, of which, from which, near which

- it is, indescribably, *naught*.

I find that this flame burns burning flamingly by *that which makes it possible* -

by that which *enables* it to have such flamingness existing.

As such, I draw-closed and fold-up the one end of *This-thisness* upon the other -

trekkingly-trek-ing-expasiveness-extend-ing-ly.

And what it is that I find -

paradoxical to this "expansion" that only ever *seems* in its expand-ing-ly-ness

- in the depths down here... "somewhere" "now" "lost" "in" "

In each case -

a phrase which "now" and "here" expresses the best possible "now and here" that can be said in a time-ing-ly-time-ness-nessing - :

"I find" *The I*.

"I find" *Self*.

And if there is *nothing* to *This* then,
because while I say "flame," I mean, verily, *every* thing,

aside from *that which enables* the flame's appearance *speakingly* and this
experiencing of "I,"
is it not so *Old Logos*, that I found *God in The Emptiness of ...*
a flame?

And if you sit here now wondering, questioning, "Why now!? Why do you
raise up the Lord only now!? When you sound like a lunatic – an atheist –
and a monster – as you burn your loved one's name!?" ...then I hope you
learn to meditate *less sparingly* and remember how very little I have,
indeed, scorned their name – having, rather, Raised it on High...*Mightier*
than All-Mighty!

...

So while stories of a place that we *long for* ----- so far away from
this here and now, far away from this damnable place that couldn't be worse
if we tried, so far away that they cause *us* to beg and plead to the
orchestral, "I Wish It Would Just End Already," in the hope that "There
might just be somewhere else, somewhere after" –

What exactly have I done in saying,
I found myself in a flame?

If within these four walls it is wont to be said, and I quote now that *vulgar*
Latin,
dixitque Deus fiat lux et facta est lux,
then have I not said precisely the same?

Have I not said:
my love is equal to me
?

And, found in that statement its inverse equation:
the one who loves me is the love whom I love
?

And, with great scientificity – that is, fundamentally, poetically:
the one who loves me is the love who I am
?

Expressing thus thusly, the fundamental existentiality:
I am – ?

...

To return, then,
un-depth-en-ing-ly lightly:
Let it be that I cannot *reflexively* prove my love were really conscious. What
does that matter? The proof is in the statement itself...precisely because it
must be true that they were in themselves, undoubtedly, conscious.

Dig-in-to it, you ... "Family,"
On this one hand, in this furthest draw of the equation:
If *This* were *but me* - would they, too, not be me?
And as such, in "their" consciousness-un-consciously-conscious-ing in-and-
as-and-with me.... *I am* still experiencing.
But now, suddenly, I am expected to settle that they are no longer
consciously-conscious-ing still with-in-and-as me?
And conversely - return-ing-ing-ly - back to the start of this, "*my damnable
offense*":

If they were *not* just illusions projected from my transcendental
misconceptions,
And were already verifiably conscious,
And *This-thisness*, verily, was the same for them,
Then the conclusion remains the same -
Name-ly,
they are Being itself.

And if they are Being itself,
Then *where* did Being go (!?)
Because...
I am still here,
Am I not?

Is it not so that I can say *this*?
And in articulating,
then I am - am I not?
And in I am-ing through articulate-ing,
then *pramata* and *prameyam*.
As such, *Being* has *gone* nowhere.
As such, *they* have gone nowhere.
With certainty -
Where *is* it they were to go?

In conclusive summary,

1. As the masters say: How could that die which is unborn?
2. I conclusively say, all funerary processions and speeches bare a child
of Ignorance.

3. But to the Soul that is eternal, without baring, without framing,
without without-ing,
I am over-joyous

4. That my Love is your Love, endingly unending.

...

A Phenomenological Reduction of the Flame: Demonstrating the Nothing-There

Let us begin with a flame—this flame here, burning before us. Our task is to systematically strip away each layer of context, each assumed relation, each condition that appears to give the flame its substantiality, its "thereness." This process will reveal not some essential "flameness" but rather the fundamental nothing-there (saturated emptiness) that makes the flame's manifestation possible.

First Order Reduction: Spatial-Physical Context The flame appears initially as situated within an immediate physical context: it burns within a candle, the candle rests upon a table, the table stands within a room, the room exists within a building. Already we can see how the flame's apparent existence depends upon this nested series of spatial relations. But let us begin removing these contexts:

Remove the room: The flame no longer has its specific "place" within the building's architecture. Remove the building: The flame loses its orientation within human-constructed space. Remove the city: The flame's urban context dissolves. Remove the geographical location: The flame's position on Earth becomes indeterminate. Remove the planetary context: The flame's relation to gravity, atmosphere, and terrestrial conditions vanishes. Remove the solar system: The flame's cosmic orientation disappears. Remove the galaxy: The flame's position within larger celestial structures dissolves. Remove the universe itself: The flame's situation within any spatial framework vanishes.

Second Order Reduction: Temporal-Causal Context The flame appears to exist within a temporal sequence: it was lit at some point, it burns now, it will eventually extinguish. It exists within causal chains: oxygen feeds it, wax fuels it, air currents shape it. Let us strip away these temporal-causal relations:

Remove future projections: The flame's anticipated extinction becomes meaningless. Remove past conditions: The flame's origin in lighting becomes irrelevant. Remove causal preconditions: The flame's dependence

on fuel sources dissolves. Remove temporal sequence: The flame's duration becomes inconceivable. Remove change itself: The flame's flickering, its very process of burning, becomes impossible to locate.

Third Order Reduction: Perceptual-Phenomenal Context The flame appears to possess certain essential qualities: brightness, warmth, color, movement. These qualities seem to constitute its "flameness." Let us examine these apparent essential characteristics:

Remove visual perception: The flame's brightness and color reveal themselves as dependent on visual apparatus. Remove thermal sensation: The flame's warmth shows itself as a relation between thermal energy and sensory capacity. Remove movement perception: The flame's dance becomes impossible without temporal-spatial framework. Remove all sensory frameworks: The flame's phenomenal qualities dissolve entirely.

Fourth Order Reduction: Conceptual-Linguistic Context The very concept "flame" carries meanings, associations, uses. These too must be stripped away:

Remove functional definitions: The flame's role in providing light or heat vanishes. Remove symbolic associations: The flame's metaphorical meanings (enlightenment, passion, destruction) dissolve. Remove linguistic framework: The very term "flame" loses its referential capacity. Remove conceptual categories: The distinction between "flame" and "not-flame" becomes meaningless.

Fifth Order Reduction: Ontological Context Finally, we must examine what appears to be the flame's very being, its existence as a distinct phenomenon:

Remove substantiality: The flame's apparent material existence shows itself as dependent on relations. Remove independence: The flame's seeming autonomy reveals itself as thoroughly conditional. Remove distinction: The boundary between flame and not-flame dissolves. Remove existence itself: The very notion of the flame's "being there" becomes impossible to maintain.

What remains after this systematic reduction? Not some essential "flameness," not some irreducible core of being, but precisely nothing-there (saturated emptiness). Yet—and this is crucial—this nothing-there is not a void or an absence. It is the very condition that makes the flame's manifestation possible. The flame "is" only because it is fundamentally empty of inherent existence.

This demonstrates why the Ego's denial is necessary for the appearance of stable phenomena. The Ego, through its activity of denial, reconstructs these layers of context, relation, and meaning that we have stripped away, creating the illusion of substantial, independent existence. Yet this very process of reconstruction, when examined carefully, reveals what it attempts to deny: the fundamental groundlessness of all phenomena.

The flame, therefore, shows itself as a perfect example of how phenomena "go to mean" through their thoroughgoing groundlessness. It is precisely because there is nothing-there that the flame can manifest as flame, can show the way to be in being. This insight extends to all phenomena, including consciousness itself, revealing why the Ego's denial is both necessary for appearance and ultimately illusory.

The "denial" or "ignorance" of the ego/Ego is not a moral or psychological or ethical function intrinsically. Rather, the ego's denial of groundlessness is the same function that enables such perspectives as beautiful, glorious, peaceful, artistic, logical, unique, individual, proud, etc. The ego simply maintains unity of phenomena, serving as the locus of the extension of being. The ego does so by engaging in the "one side of things" that has neither when nor where and is the primordial most no-thing, i.e., emptiness/saturated emptiness, which gets called "the future" in how this emptiness enables the potentiality of being and being's extension as phenomena; and engaging the "other side of things" where impermanence is perpetually deferred (even in the face of all that substantiates the clear case of complete impermanence set distinctly in contrast against permanence), deferred through the rejection, denial, or ignorance of (ignorance noun form of v. to ignore) the way "things", what shows up for us, have gone out, receded forever. The ego rejects, denies, or ignores the loss of any "thing" before any "thing" shows up "fully": For one, it is multidimensionally engaged (not only in both saturated emptiness and being, at once but also) in phenomena via such fields of engagement with phenomena like emotionally, psychologically, physiologically, existentially, empirically, quantitatively, so on and so forth -- meaning, there is an asynchronicity to the way "unified" and "discreet" phenomena show up because the densities (given by the ways (emphasis here on plural "ways") that show up that *can* get engaged in) of a given "discreet", "unified" "subject/object" have distinct mediums that do not cross-over directly without losing their distinct character. In simpler terms, the emotions *feel* a certain way about a thing, while the mind *thinks* and *imagines* a certain way about a thing, and while the body *behaves* and *does* a certain way about a thing -- but a body behaves or does a thought while never being thinking, and thinking never feeling, feeling never thinking, etc. Each therefore have their own mediation with what shows up, and what shows up is delimited to what it can show further to that specific and distinct mediating modality -- and so, the attachments that keep phenomena in a "unified" condition (the

conditionalities that we *perceive* and *apprehend*, *engage*, and call, in common talk, "thing/s") present with different degrees of potential relations, i.e., densities. That there are different densities, there are differences in the unfolding of phenomena for each mediating modality that the ego is engaging through. That there are differences in unfolding, there are differences in temporal experiencing. There are are, altogether, differences in mediation and unfolding, there is a multidimensional engagement. That there is multidimensional engagement in impermanence, there is no "thing" that *can fully* show up in "one", "unified", "embodied" "thing". Second, the ego's rejection, denial, or ignorance (occurring across multiple, asynchronous dimensions of engagement) of the loss of phenomena occurs through articulating "moments", which in this system is called "Reflexive Stabilization" (how through the process of ego, phenomena undergo a reflexively driven process in which their attachments reify them as "permanent", in their densities, making them more or less "real").

There is no consciousness. Point blank.

The ego is not conscious. It is a process in which *Being* expresses itself phenomenally, i.e., shows the impermanence of itself and not even necessarily to itself. This "shows itself to itself" conceptualization only arises because of the "hole", "the void", "the empty space", "the nothingness" in which it takes place and holds -- because * "it" (being) can unfold upon itself impermanently in such a space and do so multidimensionally precisely because there is no "discreet unity" to anything at all*. Yes, we *do* call this relationship "consciousness" and "conscious experience" -- but it is not. Saturated emptiness is not conscious. Being is not conscious. Ego is not conscious. There is simply the multidimensional elastic ekstasis of impermanence reifying the only way there really is to be, saturated emptiness -- empty, not-whole, not-completely, not-complete, not-total. But don't get it wrong about such terms "not-total" either -- *every instantiation is completely full and total, there just is not a full totality of "one thing at a time"*.